G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—20-12-15

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

19D/.-02
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 76

Serial Nos. 1-11

Papers Filed.

Month March 1907

SUBJECT.

Passes orders on the petition of one Ranjun Sappa in re the resumption and resto[ration] of certain deva dayam Inam lands, devanahalli Taluk endowed to the Mahanthana Mutt at which were alienated to others

PRE[VIOUS] REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

[illegible] was referred to the Revenue Commissioner, Bangalore which and that Officer in submitted a report on the allegations of the Petitioner.

From the Memorandum records received with the above report is abstracted as follows:— ~~a succinct account of the facts relating to the alienation is as stated below —~~

The marginally noted Survey Numbers have been Confirmed as Devadaya Inam to the Mutt during the Inam Settlement of 1843 and they were leased out to one Sapanna of Hadigenahally by the Mutt agent, Vanja Wader, on 5th June 1841, for 16 Varahas (~~Rs 56/-~~) a year

In the year 1901, the then Mutt agent Chenna Basva Wader, instituted a Suit before the Dy. Commr, Bangalore, complaining that the lease-amount for the past 2 or 3 years stood in arrears and praying that it might be ordered to be

No 3122 dated 8th April to

No S. No 15 dated 3rd Feb 1914

S. no,	Particulars,	Extent,	Assessment,
30	Wet Garden,	1-10	Rs 1-8-0
31, 32, 33	do,	1-6, 1-17, 5-24	2-0-0

Despatch.

(Hag A Sagvali chit)

disbursed to him; but the
dispute appears to have
been finally settled in 1902 by a
private understanding —
whereby it was agreed to
pay to the mutt an enhanced annual
rent of Rs 84/-. Since then
the lease-amount is said to have
been regularly paid on some
plea or other, and the lands)
are stated to have been alienated through
sale or mortgage or hypothe-
-cation, thereby creating a
lien on them. It seems appear
to have come forward and
agreed to pay favourable
rates of 150/ or more —
annually for the lands.
As the alienation referred
to has taken place subsequent
to 1853, the Inam lands
are liable to be summarily resumed
and restored for the benefit
of the institution on the —
Strength of the Government
Order no 741-50 of the Rules of 1877, published in
Mis. J-60-93 dated —
16th January 1894.

The Deputy Commi.
Mr Dawney wrote in favour of the
~~in the matter of the~~
Resumption and restoration of the Inam
lands

4/ 4

Lands to the institution, under the Rules of 1877.

Submitted for orders—

ps
29/10/04 Please write
and obtain the state
-ments of the present
claimants.

Perhaps the Officer 29/10/04 ps.

30

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

Note continued.

The Deputy Commr was accordingly written to to obtain and submit the statements of the aliences, and that officer has reported thereon together with the records bearing on the subject.

In his report received therewith, the Amildar states that he was able to (Slip A)

and submit the statements of

out of the eight aliences, as two of* them did not appear before him in spite of several notices. The aliences generally depose that the lands had alienated to their ancestors ~~leased out to them~~ for a long time past, and that the Argut of ~~on Kayam Gutta tenure~~, by the Math The Hunsomarnahalli has been receiving annual gutta from them as Kayam Gutta That annual gutta is being disbursed as agreed upon; that they have effected improvements,

* Both were of whom had already given a statement before the Amildar in 1901.

such as the construction of wells etc, at their cost for the better cultivation of the land They further state that there was some dispute with respect to the payment of sutta; but that they and Chennabasva Wadir has come to an amicable settlement whereby they has agreed To pay an enhanced Kayam Sutta of Rs 84/ per annum already referred to, and had given Razinamams accordingly on the 4th April 1902- Chickka Veeranna, one of the present holders, is unwilling To part with the land on the ground of long possession and improvements effected; while the others have not raised objection To do so. On the other hand, Chennabasva Wadir contests that the Suttadaris have alienated the lands and that Sutta

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

amounts are not being regularly disbursed

Mr. Dharmaraja Chetty

The Amildar reports that Sulla is being regularly paid by the holders, and that the petitioner, probably out of ill-will, is desirous of disturbing their possession and enjoyment of the land; and is of opinion, that the contention of the enjoyers of land that they should not be dispossessed is just. The Dy Commr having reported these facts, he was again requested to issue notices and submit the remaining aliences' statements. It was also observed that Channabasava Wadir had been receiving rent from these lands the Dy. Commr was therefor requested to furnish particulars as to the authority under which Channabasava Wadir was receiving rent, how the amounts

A (No 184 dated 9th Nov 1905)

This report is somewhat inconsistent with his report No 706 dated 6th May 1904 in which he strongly recommended the resumption and restoration of the land to the mutt (E)

&c &c

received was being appropriated etc.
(Mr Sparkes)
That officer states in reply that as
the alienees did not appear, their state-
ments could not be taken. He further
reports that there is no Guru for the
Mahantiana Matt at Devanahalli;
that it is considered
as a branch of the Hunsomarnahalli
Matt; whose Guru attends to the
disciples of the Mahantiana Matt.
Chenna Basva Wadir states that
he was appointed Agent of the
Matt estates by the late Swamy;
and that he has been managing
its affairs for the past 30 years.
He further states that the accounts
of this matt are not separately
maintained; but that they are
included in the accounts of the
Hunsomarnahalli Matt.

Submitted with a draft in which

GPB 3000—22.6.06

(Paper under disposal)

(Sept. D).

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

goes into the facts of the case

RS
12/2/07

335

Subd to the 2nd Counsellor

15/2/07

approved

KPM
16/2/07

~~Issue~~ HH 17/2/07

Subd to the Dewan HH 17/2/07

3807
17/2/07

Draft approved by Dewan as slightly revised

1/3/1907

Rec'd 375
4/3/07

Subd to the 2nd C. for sanction

HH 4/3/07

Issue HH
4/3/07

Rec
4/3/07

Seen KPM
4/3/07

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Muzarayi),—dated 16th January 1894.

MUZARAYI.

No. 741-50—Muz. F. 60-93, dated, Bangalore, 16th January 1894.

Order.—The Government resolve to republish for general information the following Notification of the late Chief Commissioner embodying the rules sanctioned by the Government of India on the subject of unauthorized alienations of Inam lands assigned to religious and charitable institutions.

A. SREENIVASSACHARLU,
Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.
The Palace Controller, Mysore.
The Inam Superintendent in Mysore.

NOTIFICATION.

The 17th November 1877.

No. 266.—Under the sanction of the Government of India, conveyed in their letters Nos. 89 R. and 105 R., dated 13th September and 29th October 1877, respectively, the following rules providing for the restoration of Inam lands unauthorizedly alienated from the religious or charitable institutions to which they were originally assigned, are published for general information :—

I. All Inam lands granted to religious and charitable institutions, and for the maintenance of persons rendering service therein, will be confirmed and continued to them, so long as the conditions of the grant are duly fulfilled.

II. Whenever it is found that such lands are diverted from the object for which they were granted, by means of sale, gift, mortgage or otherwise, the following rules shall be observed :—

A. Where such alienations were made prior to the 31st January 1853 but within 50 years computing the period of possession up to 14th December 1867, the lands or villages so alienated will, if not restored voluntarily by the holder, be confirmed and subjected to a jodi of one-half the assessment the jodi or assessment so imposed being payable direct to the institution from which they were alienated.

In the case of alienations made subsequent to 31st January 1853, a notice will be issued to the alienee or alienees requiring him or them to restore the lands to the institution to which they belong, within 6 months from the date on which the notice is served on the alienee or alienees, or his or their agent or manager who may be in charge of the lands, and on default of compliance, the lands will be summarily resumed and restored to the institution by the Revenue authorities under instructions from the Inam Superintendent.

In the case of a simple mortgage or hypothecation of the Inam lands without possession, the transaction will be declared null and void in so far as it is intended to create a lien on the lands or to treat them as security for the loan advanced.

III. Lands held for 50 years and upwards, with or without titles, computing the period of possession up to 14th December 1867, will be confirmed to the holders on the terms prescribed in the Land Inam Rules, and will not be included in the title-deed granted by the Inam Department to the religious institutions.

IV. The alienations, whether made in favor of disciples of the institutions or others unconnected with it, will be treated alike, and disposed of under these rules.

By Order,
T. CLARKE,
Secretary.

1894.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

MUZARAYI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 16th January 1894.

No. 741-50.
Muz. F. 60-93

Directing the republication of the rules on the subject of unauthorized alienations of Inam lands assigned to religious and charitable institutions.

MGCPD—120—30—12—01

READ AGAIN:—

The late Muzrai Superintendent's letter No. 84, dated 22nd July 1893, to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, observing that the monthly cash grant of Rs. 331-7-8 payable to the Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt from the T. Narsipur Taluk, being a Devadaya grant, was not liable to attachment by the Civil Court, in satisfaction of a decree obtained by one of the creditors of the Matt, and that therefore the payment of the amount to the Matt should be withheld pending orders of Government.

Government Proceedings No. 190-1—Muz. F. 57-92, dated 27th August 1894, directing that, as the object of the monthly grant of Rs. 331-7-8 had been grossly neglected, the payment of the said grant should continue to be withheld and that puja to the Brindavanams and Santarpane at the Matt, should be carried out by the Muzrai Department.

Governmnet Proceedings No. 789—Muz. F. 57-92, dated 31st January 1896, observing, with reference to a telegram from the Swamigalavaru, that, as the allowance in question was under attachment owing to the Matt's neglect of the object of the grant, the attachment could not be withdrawn without proper guarantee from the Matt for the proper fulfilment of such object.

Letter No. 84, dated 10th November 1902, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, reporting on the present situation of the Matt affairs.

Government Proceedings Camp Nos. A. & B., dated 12th April 1903, sanctioning, with reference to several petitions from the Swamigalavaru and his Agent, the disbursement, as a temporary measure, of a monthly allowance of Rs. 200, out of the cash grant of Rs. 331-7-8 per mensem, and observing that the payment of the allowance should be on the distinct understanding that the Swamigalavaru would give a correct and complete list of the jewels and other property belonging to the Matt and bind himself to account for all such property.

AND—

Kanarese letter Registered No. 1760, dated 4th day of Chaitra Bahula of the year Sobhakrutu (14th April 1903) from the Swamigalavaru to the address of the Dewan, requesting that, as the Matt is involved in debts, the Government may be pleased to take over the management of the land endowments of the institution situated in the State, and forwarding a statement showing such endowments.

No. 2413-23—Muz. F. 57-1902, DATED BANGALORE, 30TH MAY 1903.

ORDER THEREON.—From the letters of the Deputy Commissioner and the Swamigalavaru, it is observed that the affairs of the Matt are in great disorder and heavy debts have been incurred on the security of the Inam lands endowed to the Institution. On account of the involved condition of the Matt, the Swamigalavaru has requested Government to take possession of all the land endowments of the Institution situated in the Mysore Territories, in view to their being managed through Government agency. In these circumstances, the Government are pleased to comply with the request made by the Swamigalavaru, and they accordingly direct that the management of all the lands and villages belonging to the Matt, situated in the Mysore Territories, as per statement hereto annexed, be taken possession of immediately by the Deputy Commissioners of the respective Districts, who will issue needful instructions to the Amildars concerned to give due publicity to the raiyats or others, who are in actual possession thereof, that the management of the endowments in question will, from the 1st July 1903, vest in Government and not with the Matt authorities.

2. The collections on the lands and villages shall be regularly made by the Amildars under the orders of the Deputy Commissioner of the District in which they are situated, as in the case of the Government villages, the same being remitted to the Bangalore District Treasury, for investment in the Government Savings Bank in the name of the Deputy Secretary to Government in charge of the Muzrai Department The D. C. B. and other statements shall also be submitted to the Muzrai Department of Government. The Comptroller to Government will also issue needful

instructions in the matter to the Taluk and the District Treasuries concerned, arrangements being at the same time made in communication with the Deputy Secretary, Muzrai Department, to place the hitherto accumulated savings of the Matt funds in the Government Savings Bank in the name of the Deputy Secretary.

3. From the statements received from the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District as well as from the Swamigalavaru, it is observed that the Inam lands and villages endowed to the institution are situated throughout the Province except the Kadur District, and that almost all of them except Dommanakuppe in the Tumkur Taluk, and Yelavanka in the Belur Taluk, have been given away on long leases and that the rents in some cases have been taken in advance by the Swamigalavaru. Such long leases are practically temporary alienations and cannot be accepted as a matter of course by Government, under the terms of Government Notification No. 266, dated 17th November 1877. But before declaring them to be invalid, Government deem it desirable to enquire into each case and then make arrangements to determine the future terms of the lease or to cancel it. The Deputy Commissioners concerned are therefore requested to call upon the lessees to produce documentary evidence if any, within one month from the date of receipt of this order, showing how and when they came into possession of the Matt lands or villages and on what terms they have been enjoying them. On receipt of the necessary information from them, a full and clear report should be submitted on each case, together with the Deputy Commissioner's opinion as to the continuance or otherwise of the lease.

4. As regards Dommanakuppe in the Tumkur Taluk and Yelavanka in the Belur Taluk, which are both *Devadaya* Inam villages attached to the Matt, it appears that one Ranga Sreenivasachar, son of Hundi Krishnamachar, has been enjoying them in consideration of the debt said to be due to him by the Swamigalavaru. This is clearly an unauthorized alienation diverting the lands from the purpose for which they were granted, and the same is hereby cancelled under the terms of Government Notification No. 266, dated 17th November 1877. The Deputy Commissioners of the Tumkur and Hassan Districts are accordingly requested to take immediate steps to resume the villages from the possession of the alienee and place the management thereof in the hands of the Amildars of Tumkur and Belur respectively.

5. With reference to Government Order No. 689, dated 9th October 1902, directing that the Muzrai Assistant Commissioner of the Mysore District, be deputed to proceed to Sosale and get an inventory made of the jewels etc., belonging to the Matt, the Assistant Commissioner Mr. C. B. Seshagiri Rao (now Sub-Judge of Hassan) who was deputed for the purpose, reports that he did not do so, because he felt himself incompetent to value the jewels in question and that he did not handle the jewels as it seemed irreverent, if not sacrilegious. The Government are surprised and disappointed to hear of such on utter misconception of the duty expected of Mr. Seshagiri Rao. The Deputy Commissioner is therefore requested to again depute a competent Assistant Commissioner to proceed to Sosale with one or two professional men (who may be paid some small allowance from the Matt funds, if necessary) and have a correct inventory prepared and forward the same to Government with the signature of the Swamigalavaru.

6. As regards the repairs to the Matt building at Sosale, the Deputy Secretary to Government, who lately inspected the Matt on the 14th April 1903, reports that the front thotti is in a dilapidated condition and requires immediate attention. An estimate to renovate the building in question should at once be submitted for sanction.

L. ANANTASAMI RAO,
Dy. Secy. to Govt., Muzrai Dept.

To—The Deputy Commissioners of all Districts, except Kadur with spare copies for distribution to the Amildars concerned.

The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore.

The Swamigalavaru of the Sri Vyasaroyaswami Matt, (under a covering letter in Kanarese.)

The Registrar, Chief Court, Mysore, for information and communication to the Sub-Judge Mr. C. B. Seshagiri Rao, with reference to para 5.

Exd.—C.R.

Muzrai, dated 30th May 1903.

Statement showing the lands and villages attached to the Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt at Sosale, T. Narsipur Taluk.

No.	District.	Taluk.	Village etc.
1	Tumkur	Tiptur	Saratanahalli and Halkurki.
2	Do	Tumkur	Dommanakuppe.
3	Do	Do	Tirumalapur.
4	Bangalore	Closepet	Koteyala Seshagirihalli, Karenahall
5	Do	Doddballapur	Kantanakunte.
6	Do	Bangalore	Belijajiswasthi.
7	Do	Kankanhalli	Atchalu Bhatamanya.
8	Hassan	Belur	Yelavanka.
9	Do	Do	Settahalli.
10	Kolar	Goribidnur	Kankanapur.
11	Do	Sidlaghatta	Kondarajanahalli.
12	Chitaldrug	Challakere	Tipparaddahalli.
13	Do	Davangere	Devammanahalli.
14	Do	Molakalmuru	Bommanakatte and Obalapur.
15	Shimoga	Tirthahalli	Salejunakallu.
16	Do	Do	Mundavalli.
17	Mysore	T. Narsipur	Banpur.

1902-03

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 30th May 1903

No. 2413-23
Muz. F. 57-92

Directing that the management of the Inam lands and villages attached to the Sri Vyasarayaswami Matt at Sosale, T. Narsipur Taluk, be taken over under Government management.

SBP—10-6-03—200

Notes

Sagamadura. —

1 Dandamma Sapamma

2 Bandimma Sapamma

3 Gelatiada Rama —

4 Siddamma Chikkamma

5 Rudramma

6 Ramatha Kulla Basa —

7 Varasattappa Son Chikka Vera

8 Nanjundappa Son of Vera -

The first has entered into an agreement in 1900 offering Rs 60 annually for a period of 5 years — Vide Rgd Deed dated 22nd April 1900.

Anji No 11 — 4 6 5 — 10. Gundu in Sama - village

Sl 1

2

3

4

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ದಿನಾಂಕ 19ನೇ ಆಗಸ್ಟ್.

No. 3122 & 3123
8/4/04
Govt

MYSORE ~~DEWAN'S OFFICE~~,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 2159

dated 8th March 1904 received at the Muzr. Secretariat ~~Dewan's Office~~ from Bairasetti Nanjunda

-appa of Devanhalli stating

that the Devadaya Inam Land

endowed to the Mahantanjana Matt

at Devanhalli have been alienated

and that Darkhast has been made to Govt

to grant the land for Kandayane and

praying that the land may be made over to the said matt

is forwarded, together with its one enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner

Bangalore District for

favor of enquiry and

Report.

By Order,

Dy Se. 26.3.'04

BANGALORE, 19 .

~~Deputy~~ Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

Send to Govt

RS
15/3/04



1904 05 325

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore Dt

To The Secy to the Govt of Mysore Muz: Deptt.

Dated 2nd
Despatched 3rd } Sept 1904.

Received

General No.

M.S. No. 15

Enclosure No. one Petn, 6 Pprs.

3/9/04.

Submitted with a Dft to Govt for sanction to Extract Petn

Ag Secy

Muz Secy's No 3122 of 8th April 04.

Submits report on the Petn of Ranganatha of Devarahalli regarding the alienation of inam lands attached to Mahanthayyan Matt at Devarahalli

Sheet 15

2nd September 1904

From

D. Devaraj 2nd Esquire
Dy Commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

To L Anantasami Rao Esq. B.A.
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Mudrai Kacheri.

Survey No Particulars - Extent - Assessment Rs as p
31. Garden 2-- 16--0
32 — do — .1—10. 10—0—0
33 — do — 1—6. 5—0—0
1—16. 15—0—0

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 3122 of 8th April 1904, forwarding for report, petition from Nanjundappa of Devanhalli, regarding the alienation of the Inam lands attached to Mahantaiyana matt at Devanhalli, I have the honor to state that the marginally noted Inam lands in the village of Pura have been leased out to one Papanna by the then matt agent, Nanja Wader in the year 1871 for Rs. 56 or 16 varahas a year. Papanna and his father have alienated portions of these

Inam lands to Chicka Veeranna and others. As these transactions have taken place subsequent to 1853, the case falls under clause 3 of Notification N- 266 dated 17th November 1877, and hence these Devadaya Inam Lands have to be restored to the Matt.

2 The vernacular papers are dispatch with Amildar's report N- 706 dated 26th May 1904 are submitted for reference

Your most obedient servant

[signature]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
~~Deputy~~ Secretary to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Superintt of
Inam Settlements

Dated 19 Septr 1904

Despatched

Received

General No. 1091
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

Have the honor to request
to be furnished with an
extract of the Inam Regr.
pertaining to the grant
of the marginally noted
inam lands endowed
to the Mahantaiyana matt
at Devanhalli.

By order
13/9/04

13/9/04 Camp Hole Narsipur

Village — Sun: 210 Parkinlam. extent assessment
31 — Sandan — 2—4 — 16—0—0
32 — do — 1—10 — 10—0—0
33 — do — 1—6 — 9—0—0
Pura

MGCPB—1000-21-1-04

1357

1904

From
The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Mudzrai Department

Dated 30th
Despatched
Received 5th
} September & October

General No. 38
No.

Enclosure No. one

As requested in his docket No. 1091 of the 19th September 1904, has the honor to forward herewith, a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Inam lands to the Mahantana Math at Devanahalli.

Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Register Sheet No. 370

Devanahalli Taluk

Vadigenahalli Sammath

Vadigenahalli Village

Copy of the Minor Inam Register of

Class, Extent, and Value of Inam.

Number of Case as entered for Inam under one Cp in this Village.	General Class to which the Inam belongs.	Survey number and name of or fields of in the Cp viz. Wet, or Dr	Extent	
			of one whose local measure is an acre, &c. as it is to the in this C	Measure in acres and the actions in decimals.
1	2	3	4	5
		61		
		Title Deed 152	As per Patta 181.	availa
17	Devadaya	Wet & Garden.	3 Coord. = 1.98	
x			Fymoishi 1872	
Sirkar Tank & private well.		W	1.08	
		Garden	5.45	
			6.53	
			As per of 1748. 5 Dry = 3.31.	
			Struck No. 283	

Vadigenahalli Village Vadigenahalli Sammatt

Description, Tenure, and Document in Support of the Inam.

Old Survey Assess	Description of Inam for Service if it is to be ascertained whether the same is Continued. for Tanks,	Whether free of tax & C. or to Quit-i.e. Jodi, &c Amount of latter to be entered.	By whom Granted and in what year
no Survey as been made and no assessment fixed by Govt, the cess paid by ryots to the Inamdar,	1	Free.	
6	7 8	9	10

For
of the Jain
Mahantana
Matt of
Devanh

Matt
is in good
order

(ile)

?
unknown

Devanahalli Talook / Bangalore

Name and Relationship holders. Lease possession.				
Name entered in the Register for Land upto 1810.	Name entered in the ac Subsequent to 1810.	Subdivi	Residence name and age of	
13	14		15	

itten instrum in support of the cl Original Summa & miscellaneous doc and other proofs of possession of the it should be stated whe ther the am is whol without grant or is also	Name of Pr Cr	
11	12	

One Sakeed
Dated 1748
from Amildar
for produce of
the Inam
Measurin s

Examined
2-1-73
Initd Robt Cole

avail
Patti
1800 to 1811

3 Coods
5 Pa
or
Rs 14-8-11

Devanahalli
Brahmatana Brattee
Nanjeevadeva & Sarvatavad

The Inam is

District Nundidroog Division.

Original Grantee and of Subsequent and present —

regarding present owner. If the Inam has been d, the name, &c, of each Sharer should be entered in the Columns.

ation to ori-	Surviving -	irs of		with the -
ginal or gre	present incum		iginal h	ders, possess-
or Subseque			ion how o	tained, and in
nt interested holder			what year.	
16	17		18	





Abstract of the orders already issued by the Chief Commissioner or the Commissioner of the Division in cases regarding validity or excess of the Inams. Assistants opinion and recommendation

19

This Inam is not entered in the Jamabandi accounts, being an appendage of the Kuragodi village & called Kuradatola & is the Kattegudde attached to that village. It is shown in the Huttavale Patti of 1810 in Column 11 & in the Jakeed of 1848, it is said to be Dry Coorgs. I think this Inam should be allowed & the area mentioned in the Jakeed in Column 11 should be adopted.

To be Confirmed accordingly free. So long as the Math is in good order.

(Signed) C. Narasimaiengar
Assistant

6-12-72.

Review by the Personal Assistant and Confirmation by the Inam Commissioner.

~~Informed~~ but shew me the Takeed of 1748.

(Signed) Robt. Cole

31-12-72 Supt. of Inam Settlt.

Takeed examined.

(Initialed) Robt. Cole

2-1-73 Supt. of Inam Settlt.

The Takeed of 1748 is a mere chit or small piece of paper without a seal and, though it may be g. I do not think we can admit it to grant a larger area than the accounts shew & I can only confirm 3 ~~Kandies~~ Kudies 3 R.

(Initialed) Robt. Cole

2-1-73 Supt. of Inam Settlt.

Vide the correspondence ending with Survey Superintendent's Yadi No. 181/80 Dated 8th August 1895, requesting to strike off this Inam from the Register as it was measured as No. 10 Extent 5 acres and 37 guntas, and included in the ~~assets~~ of Goodi village of Sura (Sheet No. 377)

Continued Columns 20.

Accordingly Mr this has been struck off from the Register of this village. —

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Supt.t of Inam Settls.t

30-8-95

Compd. M.R

"Copy"

Inam Superintendents Office
Dated 22nd June 1900

Words. 604
Fee. 0-12-10.

J. P. Grant
Supt.t of Inam Settls.t

Register Sheet No 377.

Taluk .. Dawanhally.

Hobli .. Kadaiganahally

Village .. Ooru.

Copy of the Register of Inams in the village of Jeeur in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant. Dry, wet or garden	Extent Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas and annas, it is to be entered in the column	Metric measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
Title Deed No 904/13				
2.	Devadaya	× mix. & Garden	As per Settlement Patta of 1911. 3 Coords dry 1.94 Remainder of 1872 mix 1.8 Garden 5.45 6.53 As per Taluk 174 5 dry Coords = 3.31	

× Under Circar tank & private wells.

Sammat of Kadeghnahalli in the Taluk of Devanhalli

DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND			
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam	
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the ryots to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7		If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, &c., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, &c or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, &c., amount of latter to be entered
6	7	8	9
Unknown 14-8-11 As per Survey Assessment A. C. 3·12 5-10—		For Support of Jangam Mahantana Matta of Devanahalli Mattina good order.	Free

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sanad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, &c., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11

One Tahcid dated 1748 from Amildar for produce of the inam measuring 5 Coods

1 Sq.d 1 Entered Ab. Book

2-1-73 Copy to Inam Clk.

of Bangalore

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poorniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
		Huttivalli Cattle of 1810 and 1811 3 Coods. 5 Sag. or Rs. 14-8-11

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, &c. of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, &c.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Dowmahally Mahantona Matta	—	—	—
The Inam is enjoyed by Ironje Vadeer & Parvata Vadeer -			of Vadigas † appurtenance, called "Purada attached to that Patta of 1810 in Col. is found to be 5 should be allowed in the Faklid in free, so long order.

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION	
Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20

Vide remarks in Columns 19 & 20 of Case No. 17, Sheet No 370 Halli Village.

× × ×

This inam is not entered in the Jodi accounts, being one of the Sura Jodi Village and total "and is the Gattegadde village.

It is shown in the Huttuvali 14, and in the Jakid of 1748, it dry Coods. I think this Inam and the area mentioned Col. 11 should be adopted. To be confirmed accordingly as the Inamdar is in good

(Signed) V. N. Narasimhayya
Assistant
6/12/72

1. Whole grant Valid. Devadaya.
2. Vide para 4 of column 20 of case No 1 of this Sheet and also petition No. 13 of 20-7-1904 from the agent of the Inamdar.
3. Confirmed free so long as the Inamdar is in good order.

(Signed) J. J. Grant
Supdt of Inam Settlts in Sanpore
29/7/1904.

× × ×

Confirmed, but show me the Jakid of 1748.

(Signed) Robt Cole
Supdt of Inam Settlts
31-12-74.

Jakeed Examined
(Initialed) Robt. Cole
Supdt of Inam Settlts
2-1-73

The Jakeed of 1748 is a mere chit or small piece of paper without a seal, and though it may be genuine, I do not think we can admit it to grant a larger area than the accounts

accounts show and I can only confirm
3 Kudus.

(Initialed) Robt Cole
2-1-73 Supdt of Inam Settls.

Vide the correspondence ending with Survey Superintendent's No 181/80 dated 8th August 1895, requesting to strike off this Inam from this Register, as it was measured as No 10 extent 5 acres and 37 guntas, and included in the assets of Jodi Village of Cura (sheet No 377) accordingly this has been struck off from the Register of this Village.

(Signed) D. D. Grant
Supdt of Inam Settls
in Mysore

30/8/95.

Copy.

Inam Supdt's Office
Bangalore 30th Septr 1904
5 Octr 1904.

D Grant
Superintendent of
Inam Settlements
in Mysore

MUZRAI SECRETARIA'

1904—1905

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

Dated 4th November 1904.

Despatched 5th

Received

General No. 1599
Muzrai F. No. 76-01

Enclosure No. 1756.

His letter No. 15, dated 2nd September 1904, reporting that the lessee of the Inam lands endowed to the Mahantina matt at Devanhalli has alienated them to strangers and recommending that they may be resumed and ~~returned~~ restored to the Institution

———..———

With reference to the above, has the honour to request that the present absence of

The Inam lands referred to above, may be examined and their Statements obtained and forwarded to this Office at an early date.

2. The enclosures to this letter under reply are herewith returned for reference and resubmission together with the Statements called for above.

By Order,

Draft

Secretary.

Mirzai Department.

Ds

1905-6. 641

From

The Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore
Revenue Dept.

Dated 21st
May 1906.

Despatched

Received

General No.
M-S No. 103

Enclosure No. 1 file

His No. 1599 of 4.11.05

I have the honour to forward the statements obtained from the aliences of the Inam lands endowed to the Mahanthana matt at Devanhalli

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
5013
REVENUE SECRETARIAT

4 c

1/1
23/5/06
and 5/6/06.

Please continue the office note
Habeeb-Sahib.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District
Dated 21st May 1906.

R. V. 103
E. File.

From.
D. Devaraj Urs Esquire,
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To.
L. Anantasame Rao Esquire B. A,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness,
Mysore Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No.
dated 4th November 1904, requesting
the present alienees of the Inam
lands endowed to the Mahanteana Matt,
Devanhalli may be examined and
statements forwarded, I have the
honour to submit herewith the statements of
5 of the 8 present enjoyers of the
land taken before the Amildar from
which it will be seen that one Chicka
Veeramma objects to hand over the land
to the mutt and that the others have

no objection to do so. The other two persons did not appear before the Amildar in spite of several notices.

The Vernacular records received with the above are herewith submitted for reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedient Servant,

D Bernard
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

hmc

From

To

The Dy. Commr
Bangalore Dist

Dated

Despatched 4. 6. 06

Received

General No. 5795
No.

Enclosure No. one file.

Referring to his letter no. 103 of 21st May 1906 submitting the Statements obtained from some of the alienees of the Inam lands endowed to the Mahantiana Mutt at Devanhalli, has the honor to request again that ~~due~~ notices may be served on the remaining two alienees and their Statements also be kindly obtained and sent to this office. // It is ~~to be~~ observed that Channabasana Wadair, agent of the Hunsemaranahalli Mutt has been hitherto receiving as Agent

of the said Mutt, the Sutta amounts from the aforesaid Inam lands. The Dy. Commr. is requested to furnish inform on the points noted below.—

1) Is there a guru to the Mahantiana Mutt at Devanahalli, and if not, who has been managing its affairs?

2) Under whose authority has Channabasva Wadair been receiving the rents due from the Inam lands?

3) Has he ever maintained regular accounts for the receipts & the expenditure of the instn? &

4) The Vern. records received with the letter under reply are herewith returned for reference and re-submission.

Yrs.

DD 12/6/06
Secretary.

11/6/06

1906-07

From The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revenue Department.

Dated 28th November 1906

Despatched 29th

Received

General No.

M.S. No. 96

Enclosure No. 1 file No

Reporting on the appeal of the Mahantama Math in the Devanhalli Taluq as called for in his docket No. 5795 dated the 14th June 1906.

9782

Rifles 2 F. K. 15

21
29/11/06

W 1/12/06

M S No 96 Bangalore District

Deputy Commissioner's office

Bangalore 28th November 1906

From,

A. A Sparkes Esquire

Deputy Commissioner

Bangalore District.

To,

L Ananthaswamy Rao Esqr BA

Secretary to the Government of

H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore

Mujrai Department

Sir,

With reference to your endt No. 5795 dated 14th June 1906, in re- the appeal of Mahanta Dass in the Devanahalli Taluk, I have the honor to state that the necessary reports to that notice were again issued to the other villages, but that they did not appear. Their statements cannot therefore be taken and submitted.

2. As regards the other queries raised in the docket under reply it

it appears that for the present there is no Guru for the Vaimanam Matt and that it is continued as a branch to the Munsiam Vaimanam halli matt, the Guru of which Matt attends to the disciples of the Mahantamma Matt also.

3. Chennabasava Wamen. states that he was appointed agent of the Matt estates by the last Swami of the Matt and that he has been managing the affairs for the last thirty years

4. He further states that the accounts of this Matt are not maintained separate but that they are included in the accounts of the Munsiamanahalli Matt and that these accounts are produced before the Divisional Assistant Commissioner in connection with some of the cases.

5. The Vernacular Correspondence ending with the Devanhalli Amildar's No. 233 of

of the 1st Instant is forwarded herewith for reference. Should business [illegible] it should not be delayed in the post

I have the honour,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
[illegible]

for Registrar [illegible]
[illegible]

Mysore Sl 10

Read :—

Petition no 215-9

dated the 8th march 1904

from Byrasetti Nanjunda Rao

of Devanahalli, bringing

to notice that a Dewa-

-dinga Inam land in

the Devanahalli Taluk

endowed to the mahamut-

-tut at Devanahalli

had been alienated.

Docket no 38 dated

the 5th October 1904

from the Superintendent

of Inam Settlements in

Mysore, forwarding

a copy of the Inam Rep^t

pertaining to the ground

of

Appd by the C^r
& by the Dewan.

Govt
Print Press
4/3/07

3.C6/pis

of the Inam land in question.

Correspondence ending with letter no 96 dated the 29th November 1906 from the Dy Commr Bangalore District.

Order:— No 4356-64 dy 6.3.07
Exec. no file

The lands hereinafter in the margin are Devarayapatna situated Inam lands in the Inam village in the Devanahalli Taluk, endowed to the ganigara Mahalakshma matt at Devanahalli for its support. The matt and its endowments were have been under the supervision of

S. no.	Subdivn.	Extent A. G.	Assessment Rs.
130	West	1 — 8	7 — 8 — 0
31	Lyadam	2 — 0	16 — 0 — 0
2	"	1 — 10	10 — 0 — 0
3	"	1 — 6	9 — 0 — 0

the Priest of the Hanumanmukki matt in the same Taluk, having had no separate Jagir for it.

2. The records of enquiry show that of the 5 numbers detailed in para 1 two have in the enjoyment of the Jagirdar himself (the matt) and that the remaining 3 numbers have been alienated. The circumstances of the alienation are described below:—

3. Kanja Wadiya of the Hanumanmukki matt leased out the lands

lands to one Dandamma
Papamma on the 5th
June 1871 for an annual
quitta of 16 Varahas, and
on the condition of the
latter giving him half
the produce of the
tamarind tree standing
on the lands. The Sugandi
Chit as it is called,
which is an unregistered
one did not make
any mention of the period
for which the lands had
been leased out - The
lessee and his sons
Papamma appear to have paid
the lease amount
to the mutt regularly along with o
till the year 1901, but
they hold in the meanwhile
given

given out for

to others some portion

of the lands, and

alienated ~~adjoining~~ the others,

reserving for themselves a portion of it.

The lands passed into

several hands through

sale, mortgage &c and

the present holders

are 8 in number as

noted in the margin,

including the son of

the original lessee.

The 1st holder admits

~~stands~~ and the other holders'

~~stand~~ his responsibility

~~for~~ for the payment of Rs 84-4-0

to the suit on the entire

lands as agreed upon

by them

boundaries in 1902, and

acknowledges the fact

of his having alienated

some

Dodderamane Sapumma

Buddimane Sapumma

Yeletotada Ramu

Yidduruvanara Chikkamma

Ruderumuniyappa

Ashwatha Kallu

Basamma

Chikka Veeramma son

of Veerasettappa

, Muniyappa, son of

Veeramma

some portions of the
lands to Chikka Veeramma
and Madhura Chinna
Basappa - He also states
that some other portions
were mortgaged by
his uncle Lakshmamma
to Veerabhadrappa, Gindam ~~mma~~
Chikkamma and Rudra-
gowdigappa.

The 2nd and the
3rd holders state
that they are only sub-
tenants of the 1st
holder and that they
have not alienated their
portions to any one -

The 4th holder, in his first
statement
before the Amildar on the 25th August
owned the said that
the portion enjoyed by
him belonged to the Hunsamanahalli matt but in his
2nd statement before the Amildar the Lubk
matt

on the

his ignorance of the matt, and he contends that
ownership of the it was sold to his
brother-in-law in 1887
by one Basavanna
Chikkamuttha, alleging
that it was his
and
Ramalingam knew ^ the
that it was again sold to him
however says that
about 17 years ago. He was paying annually
to the basavanbasa Rs 2 on the
land to the representative
of the matt, ^ and that
was basavanbasa since raised to Rs 3.
The 5th holder

N & P

Ramana maniyagara
represents that the
property, which is now in
his enjoyment, was
sold to him in 1898
by one Madigappa, who
alleged that it was
his Kandayam land

The

The 6th witness Annamma

Kallu Basavanna states

that the portion of the

land in his enjoyment

came to the possession

of his grand-father

Basavanna under a mortgage

Deed executed in his

favour by one Basavanna

in the year Prameedoota

and that a sum of

per annum

Rs 2 is since then being

paid on the land to

the Hanumanmahalli

math.

The Seventh witness P & R.

Chikkavenkamma states

portion of the

that the land in question

came to the possession

of his ancestors Mukunj

through alienations

years ago and that

the

he has been [illegible]
Ramdayam [illegible]
to the Agents of the
Housemanchilimatt.

He further says that
as he has spent a large
amount on the improve-
ment of the land, he
cannot resign it in
favour of the matt.

The 8th holder
mr gurudutta is reported
to have not appeared
before the Auditor
although notices were
duly issued to him —

4. Under the circum-
-stances detailed above
the Auditors misses
on Ramya Rao (mem-
Excise Asst Commr)

and Shamugaj Chetty
and the Dy Commr
Mr Dumaraj Urs are
of opinion that as
the alienations have
taken place subsequent
to 1853, the case falls
under Clause B of the
Alienation Rules of 1877
and therefore the lands
have to be resumed and
restored to the matt.

5 The fact that
the land in question is
a Devadaya Inam land
granted for the maintenance
of the matt is unquestionable,
as is evidenced by the
Copy of the Inam Regr
received from the

Inam

Indian Superintendent.

That it belongs to the

Humuwamahelli matt

is admitted by the

aliases himselves,

aliases ^ as they say

that they have been

paying the Kanakuyam

on their portions to the

representative of the

matt. The original

lessee Dorothea Sapunna's

-son Sapunna increased

compasses that the

and his father —

eliminated some portions

of the lands for want-

of funds - All that

^ the aliases

represent is

that portions of the

Devendaya Indian lands

in question came to the
possession of their ancestors
by means of sale or
mortgage, and bring forward
their long enjoyment
as the chief reasons
for not giving up in
favour of the Matt.

A few of the Elders have
also put forth
the plea that Chuma -
- because Wadiam, the
Agent of the Hussawamakulli
Matt
had agreed to receive from them
Khongani Cotton on the
land, 6. The Govt
are of opinion that
neither the Agent
nor the Priest of the
Matt is authorized
to permanently lease out -

2 acres

the Darbhanga Zamindari is to the prejudice of the Mutt's interests. Even long leases - not to speak of permanent leases - are practically temporary alienations and have not been completed by grant in some instances. (Vide para 3 of the Govt Res No. 2413-23 dated the 30th May 1903.) The original lessee of the Mutt, Sankara Papanna had no authority to alienate the land in question.

7. In these circumstances, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to direct the cancellation of the alienations in

in pursuance of the
Government notification
no 266 dated the 17th
November 1877. The Dy
Commissioner is requested
to take action as per clause
B of the Rule II of the
said notification and
report ~~in~~ to Government
in due course the fact
of the lands having been
resumed and restored
to the mutt.

8 The Guest of the
mutt should be informed
that the action of his
Agent Chinnabasawa
Wodeyar in having summarily
leased out the lands, as alleged by some of the
ryots was unauthorised and aliened,

that

a
must the repetition of
either by him or by his Agent
the same wanton
entail the resumption
of the matt's land to
Government.

9. The alienees should
be informed by means
of Endorsements that
it was the fault of their
ancestors or of themselves
to have accepted the
alienations of the Darra-
-dunga Zemin lands which
are inalienable, and
that they may, if they
choose, prosecute against
the alienors for any
loss that may have been
sustained by them

Secretary
Revenue Department

12/2/07

12/2/07

To

The Dy Commr Bangalore

District, returning the

Ver: records -

The Supt of Inam

Settlements in Mysore

The Dy Commrs of

Other Dts for information

H365

Encl: to Bz proceedings

mentioned supra

W.P. 4365 of 13.3.0

deed executed in his favor by one Basanna in the year Pramoduta and that a sum of Rs. 2 per annum is since then being paid on the land to the Hunsamaranahalli Matt.

8. The 7th holder Chikka Veeranna states that the portion of the land in question came to the possession of his ancestors many years ago through alienations and that he has been paying kandayam thereon to the agent of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt. He further states that as he has spent a large amount on the improvement of the land, he cannot resign it in favor of the Matt.

9. The 8th holder Muguvalappa is reported to have not appeared before the Amildar although notices were duly issued to him.

10. Under the circumstances detailed above, the Amildars, Messrs. M. Ranga Rao, (now Excise Assistant Commissioner) and Dharmaraj Chetty and the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Devaraj Urs, are of opinion that as the alienations have taken place subsequent to 1853, the case falls under clause B of the alienation Rules of 1877 and that the lands have therefore to be resumed and restored to the Matt.

11. The fact that the land in question is a Devadaya Inam land granted for the maintenance of the Matt is unquestionable as is evidenced by the copy of the Inam Register received from the Inam Superintendent. That it belongs to the Hunsamaranahalli Matt is admitted by the alienees themselves, as they say that they have been paying the kandayam on their portions to the representative of the Matt. The original lessee, Dodda Papanna's son Papanna, unreservedly confesses that he and his father alienated some portions of the lands for want of funds. All that the alienees represent is that the portions of the Devadaya Inam lands in question came to the possession of their ancestors by means of sale or mortgage and bring forward their long enjoyment as the chief reason for not giving them up in favor of the Matt. A few of the alienees have also put forth the plea that Channabasava Wadeyar, the agent of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt, had agreed to receive from them kayamgutta on the land.

12. The Government are of opinion that neither the agent nor the priest of the Matt is authorized to permanently lease out Devadaya Inam lands to the prejudice of the Matt's interests. Even long leases, not to speak of permanent leases, are considered to be practically temporary alienations and were not accepted by Government in some instances (*vide* para 3 of Government Proceedings No. 2413-23—Muz. F. 57-92, dated the 30th May 1903). The original lessee of the Matt, Dodda Papanna, had no authority to alienate the land in question.

13. In these circumstances the Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to direct the cancellation of the alienations in pursuance of Government Notification No. 266, dated the 17th November 1877. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take action as per clause B of Rule II of said notification and report to Government in due course the fact of the lands having been resumed and restored to the Matt.

14. The priest of the Matt should be informed that the action of his agent Channabasava Wadeyar in having permanently leased out the lands as alleged by some of the alienees was unauthorized and that a repetition of the same either by him or by his agent would entail the resumption of the Matt's land to Government.

15. The alienees should be informed by means of Endorsements that it was the fault of their ancestors or of themselves to have accepted the alienations of the Devadaya Inam lands, which are inalienable.

Secy. to Govt., Muzrai Dept.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, returning the vernaculur records.
The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts for information.

Exd.—c. v.

READ—

Petition No. 2159, dated the 8th March 1904, from Byrasetti Nanjundappa of Devanhalli, bringing to notice that a Devadaya Inam land in the Devanhalli Taluk endowed to the Mahantana Matt at Devanhalli had been alienated.

Docket No. 38, dated the 5th October 1904, from the Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore, forwarding a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of the Inam land in question.

Correspondence ending with letter No. 96, dated the 29th November 1906, from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

No. 4356-64—MUZ. 76-01, DATED BANGALORE, 6TH MARCH 1907.

ORDER THEREON.—The lands particularized in the margin are Devadaya Inam lands situated in the Pura village in the Devanhalli Taluk endowed to the Jangum Mahantana Matt at Devanhalli for its support. The Matt and its endowments have been under the supervision of the priest of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt in the same taluk, having had no [illegible]e Iyya for it.

Survey No.	Particulars.	Extent. A.	g.	Assessment. Rs.	a.	p.
30	Wet ...	1	8	7	8	0
31	Garden ...	2	0	16	0	0
32	Do ...	1	10	10	0	0
33	Do ...	1	6	9	0	0
	Total ...	5	24	42	8	0

2. The records of enquiry show that Survey No. 30, out of the four numbers detailed in para 1, has been in the enjoyment of the Jodidar himself (the Matt) and that the remaining three numbers have been alienated. The circumstances of the alienations are described below.

3. Nanja Waderu of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt leased out the lands to one Doddamane Papanna on the 5th June 1871 for an annual gutta of 16 varahas and on the condition of the latter giving him half the produce of the tamarind tree standing on the lands. The saguvali chit, as it is called, which is an unregistered one, did not make any mention of the period for which the lands had been leased out. The lessee and his son Papanna appear to have paid the lease amount to the Matt regularly along with others till the year 1901, but they had in the meanwhile given out for cultivation to others some portion of the lands and alienated the others, reserving for themselves a portion of it. The lands passed into several hands through sale, mortgage, etc., and the present holders are eight in number as noted in the margin, including the son of the original lessee. The 1st holder admits his and the other holders' responsibility for the payment of Rs. 84-4-0 to the Matt on the entire lands, as agreed upon by them in 1902, and acknowledges the fact of his having alienated some portions of the lands to Chikka Veeranna and Madhure Channa Basappa. He also states that some other portions were mortgaged by his uncle Lakshmanna to Veerasettappa, Giddannanavara Chikkanna and Rudramuniyappa.

1. Doddamane Papanna.
2. Buddimane Papanna.
3. Yelitotada Rama.
4. Giddannanavara Chikkanna.
5. Rudramuniyappa.
6. Aswathakallu Basanna.
7. Chikka Veeranna, son of Veerasettappa.
8. Muguvalappa, son of Veeranna.

4. The 2nd and the 3rd holders state that they are only sub-tenants of the 1st holder and that they have not alienated their portions to any one.

5. The 4th holder in his 1st statement before the Amildar Mr. Ranga Rao on the 25th August 1901 owned the fact that the portion enjoyed by him belonged to the Hunsamaranahalli Matt, but in his 2nd statement before the Taluk Sheristadar, on the 8th May 1905, he pleades his ignorance of the ownership of the Matt, and he argues that it was sold to his brother-in-law in 1887 by one Basavanna Chikkannappa, alleging that it was his kandayam land and that it was again sold to him about 17 years ago. He however says that he was paying annually Rs. 2 on the land to the representative of the Matt and that the amount was since raised to Rs. 3.

6. The 5th holder Rudramuniyappa represents that the portion, which is now in his enjoyment, was sold to him in 1898 by one Maligappa, who alleged that it was his kandayam land.

7. The 6th holder Aswathakallu Basanna states that the portion of the land in his enjoyment came to the possession of his grandfather Basanna under a mortgage

1906-07

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 6th March 1907

No. 4356-64 / Muz. F. 76-01

Passing orders on the petition of one Byra Setti Nanjundappa, *in re* the resumption and restoration of certain Devadaya Inam lands in the Devanhalli Taluk endowed to the Mahantana Matt at Devanhalli, which were alienated to others.

GPB—26 3 07—200

READ—

Petition No. 2159, dated the 8th March 1904, from Byrasetti Nanjundappa of Devanhalli, bringing to notice that a Devadaya Inam land in the Devanhalli Taluk endowed to the Mahantana Matt at Devanhalli had been alienated.

Docket No. 38, dated the 5th October 1904, from the Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore, forwarding a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of the Inam land in question.

Correspondence ending with letter No. 96, dated the 29th November 1906, from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

No. 4356-64—MUZ. 76-01, DATED BANGALORE, 6TH MARCH 1907.

ORDER THEREON.—The lands particularized in the margin are Devadaya Inam lands situated in the Pura village in the Devanhalli Taluk endowed to the Jangum Mahantana Matt at Devanhalli for its support. The Matt and its endowments have been under the supervision of the priest of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt in the same taluk, having had no separate Iyya for it.

Survey No.	Particulars.	Extent. A.	g.	Assessment. Rs.	a.	p.
30	Wet ...	1	8	7	8	0
31	Garden ...	2	0	16	0	0
32	Do ...	1	10	10	0	0
33	Do ...	1	6	9	0	0
	Total ...	5	24	42	8	0

2. The records of enquiry show that Survey No. 30, out of the four numbers detailed in para 1, has been in the enjoyment of the Jodidar himself (the Matt) and that the remaining three numbers have been alienated. The circumstances of the alienations are described below.

3. Nanja Waderu of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt leased out the lands to one Doddamane Papanna on the 5th June 1871 for an annual gutta of 16 varahas and on the condition of the latter giving him half the produce of the tamarind tree standing on the lands. The saguvali chit, as it is called, which is an unregistered one, did not make any mention of the period for which the lands had been leased out. The lessee and his son Papanna appear to have paid the lease amount to the Matt regularly along with others till the year 1901, but they had in the meanwhile given out for cultivation to others some portion of the lands and alienated the others, reserving for themselves a portion of it. The lands passed into several hands through sale, mortgage, etc., and the present holders are eight in number as noted in the margin, including the son of the original lessee. The 1st holder admits his and the other holders' responsibility for the payment of Rs. 84-4-0 to the Matt on the entire lands, as agreed upon by them in 1902, and acknowledges the fact of his having alienated some portions of the lands to Chikka Veeranna and Madhure Channa Basappa. He also states that some other portions were mortgaged by his uncle Lakshmanna to Veerasettappa, Giddannanavara Chikkanna and Rudramuniyappa.

1. Doddamane Papanna.
2. Buddimane Papanna.
3. Yelitotada Rama.
4. Giddannanavara Chikkanna.
5. Rudramuniyappa.
6. Aswathakallu Basanna.
7. Chikka Veeranna, son of Veerasettappa.
8. Muguvalappa, son of Veeranna.

4. The 2nd and the 3rd holders state that they are only sub-tenants of the 1st holder and that they have not alienated their portions to any one.

5. The 4th holder in his 1st statement before the Amildar Mr. Ranga Rao on the 25th August 1901 owned the fact that the portion enjoyed by him belonged to the Hunsamaranahalli Matt, but in his 2nd statement before the Taluk Sheristadar, on the 8th May 1905, he pleades his ignorance of the ownership of the Matt, and he argues that it was sold to his brother-in-law in 1887 by one Basavanna Chikkannappa, alleging that it was his kandayam land and that it was again sold to him about 17 years ago. He however says that he was paying annually Rs. 2 on the land to the representative of the Matt and that the amount was since raised to Rs. 3.

6. The 5th holder Rudramuniyappa represents that the portion, which is now in his enjoyment, was sold to him in 1898 by one Maligappa, who alleged that it was his kandayam land.

7. The 6th holder Aswathakallu Basanna states that the portion of the land in his enjoyment came to the possession of his grandfather Basanna under a mortgage

Muzrai, dated 6th March 1907.

deed executed in his favor by one Basanna in the year Pramoduta and that a sum of Rs. 2 per annum is since then being paid on the land to the Hunsamaranahalli Matt.

8. The 7th holder Chikka Veeranna states that the portion of the land in question came to the possession of his ancestors many years ago through alienations and that he has been paying kandayam thereon to the agent of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt. He further states that as he has spent a large amount on the improvement of the land, he cannot resign it in favor of the Matt

9. The 8th holder Muguvalappa is reported to have not appeared before the Amildar although notices were duly issued to him.

10. Under the circumstances detailed above, the Amildars, Messrs M Ranga Rao, (now Excise Assistant Commissioner) and Dharmaraj Chetty and the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Devaraj Urs, are of opinion that as the alienations have taken place subsequent to 1853, the case falls under clause B of the alienation Rules of 1877 and that the lands have therefore to be resumed and restored to the Matt.

11. The fact that the land in question is a Devadaya Inam land granted for the maintenance of the Matt is unquesti as is evidenced by the copy of the Inam Register received from the Inam Superintendent. That it belongs to the Hunsamaranahalli Matt is admitted by the alienees themselves, as they say that they have been paying the kandayam on their portions to the representative of the Matt. The original lessee, Dodda Papanna's son Papanna, unreservedly confesses that he and his father alienated some portions of the lands for want of funds. All that the alienees represent is that the portions of the Devadaya Inam lands in question came to the possession of their ançestors by means of sale or mortgage and bring forward their long enjoyment as the chief reason for not giving them up in favor of the Matt. A few of the alienees have also put forth the plea that Channabasava Wadeyar, the agent of the Hunsamaranahalli Matt, had agreed to receive from them kayamgutta on the land.

12. The Government are of opinion that neither the agent nor the priest of the Matt is authorized to permanently lease out Devadaya Inam lands to the prejudice of the Matt's interests Even long leases, not to speak of permanent leases, are considered to be practically temporary alienations and were not accepted by Government in some instances (*vide* para 3 of Government Proceedings No 2413-23—Muz. F. 57-92, dated the 30th May 1903). The original lessee of the Matt, Dodda Papanna, had no authority to alienate the land in question.

13. In these circumstances the Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to direct the cancellation of the alienations in pursuance of Government Notification No. 266, dated the 17th November 1877. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take action as per clause B of Rule II of said notification and report to Government in due course the fact of the lands having been resumed and restored to the Matt.

14. The priest of the Matt should be informed that the action of his agent Channabasava Wadeyar in having permanently leased out the lands as alleged by some of the alienees was unauthorized and that a repetition of the same either by him or by his agent would entail the resumption of the Matt's land to Government.

15. The alienees should be informed by means of Endorsements that it was the fault of their ancestors or of themselves to have accepted the alienations of the Devadaya Inam lands, which are inalienable.

L. ANANTASAMI RAO,
Secy. to Govt., Muzrai Dept.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, returning the vernacular records.
The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts for information.

Exd —C. V.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Passing orders on the petition of one Bora Setti Nanjappa, re the resumption and restoration of certain Devadana Inam lands in the Devarbalu Tank endowed to the Malavalana Matt at Devarayi which were alienated to others

4893
27/4/07

Affix court fee stamp and
cancel it

Signature of the petitioner

Address

Petition for grant of succession certificate in respect of the debts and securities of the deceased person mentioned in the schedule hereto.

The petition of Sreedharan Nair, son of Kunjan Nair, residing at Kuzhikkattu House, Kuzhikkattu Desom, Kuzhikkattu Amsom, Kuzhikkattu Muri, Kuzhikkattu Village, Kuzhikkattu Taluk, Kuzhikkattu District, Kuzhikkattu Pin 680 123.

Most respectfully sheweth as follows:

1. The petitioner is the son of the deceased person mentioned in the schedule hereto.

2. The deceased person died on 10.3.07 at Kuzhikkattu Hospital, Kuzhikkattu.

3. The deceased person left a will dated 15.1.07 which is in the custody of the petitioner.

4. The petitioner is the executor named in the said will.

5. The petitioner has not intermeddled with the estate of the deceased person.

6. The petitioner is entitled to the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

7. The petitioner has not applied for any other succession certificate in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

8. The petitioner has not received any part of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

9. The petitioner has not executed any deed of release in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

10. The petitioner has not executed any deed of assignment in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

11. The petitioner has not executed any deed of mortgage in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

12. The petitioner has not executed any deed of charge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

13. The petitioner has not executed any deed of pledge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

14. The petitioner has not executed any deed of hypothecation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

15. The petitioner has not executed any deed of lien in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

16. The petitioner has not executed any deed of set-off in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

17. The petitioner has not executed any deed of novation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

18. The petitioner has not executed any deed of compromise in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

19. The petitioner has not executed any deed of arbitration in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

20. The petitioner has not executed any deed of reference in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

21. The petitioner has not executed any deed of award in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

22. The petitioner has not executed any deed of decree in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

23. The petitioner has not executed any deed of judgment in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

24. The petitioner has not executed any deed of order in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

25. The petitioner has not executed any deed of direction in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

26. The petitioner has not executed any deed of injunction in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

27. The petitioner has not executed any deed of attachment in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

28. The petitioner has not executed any deed of sale in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

29. The petitioner has not executed any deed of lease in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

30. The petitioner has not executed any deed of licence in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

31. The petitioner has not executed any deed of easement in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

32. The petitioner has not executed any deed of partition in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

33. The petitioner has not executed any deed of exchange in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

34. The petitioner has not executed any deed of gift in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

35. The petitioner has not executed any deed of trust in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

36. The petitioner has not executed any deed of agency in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

37. The petitioner has not executed any deed of power of attorney in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

38. The petitioner has not executed any deed of revocation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

39. The petitioner has not executed any deed of cancellation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

40. The petitioner has not executed any deed of rectification in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

41. The petitioner has not executed any deed of variation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

42. The petitioner has not executed any deed of modification in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

43. The petitioner has not executed any deed of supplement in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

44. The petitioner has not executed any deed of confirmation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

45. The petitioner has not executed any deed of ratification in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

46. The petitioner has not executed any deed of validation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

47. The petitioner has not executed any deed of perfection in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

48. The petitioner has not executed any deed of completion in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

49. The petitioner has not executed any deed of termination in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

50. The petitioner has not executed any deed of discharge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

51. The petitioner has not executed any deed of satisfaction in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

52. The petitioner has not executed any deed of release in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

53. The petitioner has not executed any deed of assignment in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

54. The petitioner has not executed any deed of mortgage in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

55. The petitioner has not executed any deed of charge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

56. The petitioner has not executed any deed of pledge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

57. The petitioner has not executed any deed of hypothecation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

58. The petitioner has not executed any deed of lien in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

59. The petitioner has not executed any deed of set-off in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

60. The petitioner has not executed any deed of novation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

61. The petitioner has not executed any deed of compromise in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

62. The petitioner has not executed any deed of arbitration in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

63. The petitioner has not executed any deed of reference in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

64. The petitioner has not executed any deed of award in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

65. The petitioner has not executed any deed of decree in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

66. The petitioner has not executed any deed of judgment in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

67. The petitioner has not executed any deed of order in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

68. The petitioner has not executed any deed of direction in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

69. The petitioner has not executed any deed of injunction in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

70. The petitioner has not executed any deed of attachment in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

71. The petitioner has not executed any deed of sale in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

72. The petitioner has not executed any deed of lease in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

73. The petitioner has not executed any deed of licence in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

74. The petitioner has not executed any deed of easement in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

75. The petitioner has not executed any deed of partition in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

76. The petitioner has not executed any deed of exchange in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

77. The petitioner has not executed any deed of gift in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

78. The petitioner has not executed any deed of trust in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

79. The petitioner has not executed any deed of agency in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

80. The petitioner has not executed any deed of power of attorney in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

81. The petitioner has not executed any deed of revocation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

82. The petitioner has not executed any deed of cancellation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

83. The petitioner has not executed any deed of rectification in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

84. The petitioner has not executed any deed of variation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

85. The petitioner has not executed any deed of modification in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

86. The petitioner has not executed any deed of supplement in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

87. The petitioner has not executed any deed of confirmation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

88. The petitioner has not executed any deed of ratification in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

89. The petitioner has not executed any deed of validation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

90. The petitioner has not executed any deed of perfection in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

91. The petitioner has not executed any deed of completion in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

92. The petitioner has not executed any deed of termination in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

93. The petitioner has not executed any deed of discharge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

94. The petitioner has not executed any deed of satisfaction in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

95. The petitioner has not executed any deed of release in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

96. The petitioner has not executed any deed of assignment in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

97. The petitioner has not executed any deed of mortgage in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

98. The petitioner has not executed any deed of charge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

99. The petitioner has not executed any deed of pledge in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

100. The petitioner has not executed any deed of hypothecation in respect of the debts and securities mentioned in the schedule hereto.

Petitioner

Verification

I, Sreedharan Nair, son of Kunjan Nair, residing at Kuzhikkattu House, Kuzhikkattu Desom, Kuzhikkattu Amsom, Kuzhikkattu Muri, Kuzhikkattu Village, Kuzhikkattu Taluk, Kuzhikkattu District, Kuzhikkattu Pin 680 123, do hereby verify that the contents of the above petition are true to my knowledge and belief.

Verified on 27/4/07

Petitioner

Witness

Witness

Advocate

Petition granted

14.5.07

14/5/07